

Application No. 09/585,747  
Filed: June 2, 2000  
TC Art Unit: 2132  
Confirmation No.: 7128

### REMARKS

In response to an Office Action mailed on February 23, 2005, Applicants respectfully request that the above-listed Amendments be entered and the Application be reconsidered. With entry of the above-listed Amendments, claims 1, 4, 5, 8 and 21 are amended. Claims 1, 4, 5 and 8 are independent, and the remaining claims are dependent.

The Applicants appreciate the time and courtesy extended by the Examiners during a telephonic interview with the undersigned attorney on June 9, 2005. During the interview, the following issues were discussed: the lack of enablement rejections of claims 12 and 14; the Gupta reference in relation to claims 1 and 4, as well as proposed claim amendments to claims 1 and 4; and proposed claim amendments to claim 8. Agreement was reached on all these issues.

The Examiner objected to claim 1, because of an informality. Claim 1 has been amended to overcome this objection.

Claims 12 and 14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, for lack of enablement. The Examiner asserted that the specification fails to disclose any information about protecting passwords. The Applicants note that the claims do not recite password protection. Thus, no such disclosure is believed to be required. Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

The Examiner rejected claims 5-8 and 16-24 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Claims 5, 8, 21 and 22 have been amended to overcome the rejections.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-4, 8, 13, 15 and 21-22 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over US Pat. No. 6,266,752 to Gupta, *et al.* ("Gupta") in view of US Pat. No. 6,158,010 to Moriconi, *et al.* ("Moriconi").

The Examiner rejected claims 12 and 14 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) over Gupta, in view of Moriconi and further in view of US Pat. No. 6,421,768 to Purpura ("Purpura").

Gupta discloses an authentication server that authenticates a user by checking a username/password, by a challenge-response mechanism or by use of a smart card. (Col. 12, lines 24-41.) Once the user is authenticated, a session is created for the user, and session information is

Application No. 09/585,747  
Filed: June 2, 2000  
TC Art Unit: 2132  
Confirmation No.: 7128

passed to an application server. (Col. 12, lines 42-49.) The session information can be stored on the user's computer in the form of a token or "cookie." The application server can use the session information to determine if the user has been previously authorized. (Col. 12, lines 49-58.)

The application server can also cache the session information. Thus, the application server can determine if the user has been previously authorized (i.e., a session has been created), without contacting the authentication server for subsequent requests from the user. (Col. 13, lines 19-22.) However, the application server does not store, or have access to, any information that can be used to authenticate the user. In fact, Gupta teaches away from authenticating the user by the application server. (Col. 13, lines 30-40 and col. 11, lines 10-24.)

In contrast, claims 1 and 4 have been amended to recite, "if the user is successfully authenticated, the response (from the second data processing agent) includes authentication information that the first data processing agent can use to subsequently re-authenticate the user without submitting a subsequent authentication request to the second data processing agent." No art of record, either alone or in combination, discloses or suggest the recited limitation. Thus, independent claims 1 and 4 are believed to be allowable.

Claims 2, 3 and 12-15 depend directly or indirectly from claim 1 or claim 4. Thus, these dependent claims are believed to be allowable, for at least the reasons presented with respect to claims 1 and 4.

The Examiner rejected claim 8 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Gupta. Claim 8 has been amended to include a recitation consistent with the reason given by the Examiner for finding claim 5 to be allowable. That is, claim 8 has been amended to recite "the second data processing agent is configured to restart the first time out value in response to receiving the notification (that a second service request has been received from the user) after receiving a previous notification, relative to the user, from another one of the first data processing agents." Thus, it is believe that independent claim 8 is allowable.

Claims 21 and 22 depend directly or indirectly from independent claim 8. These dependant claims are, therefore, believed to be allowable, for at least the reasons presented with respect to claim 8.

Application No. 09/585,747  
Filed: June 2, 2000  
TC Art Unit: 2132  
Confirmation No.: 7128

The Examiner rejected claims 23 and 24 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Gupta in view of Moriconi, and further in view of US Pat. No. 6,629,089 to Hambrecht, et al. ("Hambrecht"). Claims 23 and 24 depend indirectly from claim 8. These dependent claims, are therefore, believed to be allowable for at least the reasons presented with claim 8.

The Applicants note with appreciate the allowable subject matter identified by the Examiner in claims 5-7 and 16-20. As noted above, claim 5 has been amended to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph.

For all the foregoing reasons, it is respectfully submitted that the present Application is in a condition for allowance, and such action is earnestly solicited. The Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned attorney to discuss any matter that would expedite allowance of the present Application.

Respectfully submitted,

SMARAGDA HADJINIKITAS ET AL.

By: 

George J. Jakobsche  
Registration No. 39,236  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,  
GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP  
Ten Post Office Square  
Boston, MA 02109  
Telephone: (617) 542-2290  
Telecopier: (617) 451-0313

GJJ/mac  
318118-1

-10-

WEINGARTEN, SCHURGIN,  
GAGNEBIN & LEOVICI LLP  
TEL. (617) 542-2290  
FAX. (617) 451-0313